Date: January 2000

To: NEAFCS Board
        NAE4-HA Board
        ESP Board
        NACAA Board
        Neld Alumni
        1890's Administrators
        1994 Administrators
        PODC

From: Organizational Culture and Change Sub-Committee, PODC

RE: Scenario Responses and Summarization

The Personnel and Organizational Development Committee(PODC) in cooperation with the Strategic Planning Council(SPC) surveyed the system in June for help in articulating visions for the future. The goal of the project was to help the Cooperative Extension System move through change faster. We appreciate your participation in this project.

Two hundred twenty-five surveys were sent to a selected group of Extension leaders across the country. The 71 surveys returned represented a 32% response rate. 30% of the participants selected scenario #1; 15% chose scenario #2; and 35% responded to scenario #3. Enclosed are summaries of the responses for each scenario.

Common themes mentioned in all three scenarios are:
•   Fewer long term employees
•   Less job security
•   Increased use of contract employees
•   Fewer employees with a history and loyalty to Cooperative Extension
•   Less emphasis on agriculture
•   More demand for family, youth, and community programming
•   Community based systems approach to programming

In addition, several competencies for Extension Educators were consistent for all three scenarios. Competencies include skills in communications, facilitation, resource management, and use of technology. Other competencies cited are ability to identify resources and access information, organizational skills, effective utilization of the political process, anc creative/critical thinking.

A report about the process of using scenarios and the results of this pilot was shared at the October

ECOP meeting. The sub-committee hopes that you will use these results to stimulate further thinking and discussion about organizational change within the system. If you wish additional information about the scenario process or results, contact Bill Peterson, chair of the sub-committee on Organizational Culture and Change, at **bpeters@ag.arizona.edu**

Cc: Dr. Sharon Anderson, ECOP Chair

Scenario #1

In 2010, the disparity among county programs is the direct result of increasing numbers of mandated programs, increasing demand for lower taxes, and declining financial support for Extension. Local Cooperative Extension System(CES) county programs continue to exist in politically well positioned counties with sound local funding bases and excellent marketing systems. Other counties are served by individuals from universities and private colleges with outreach efforts. Where Extension programs continue to flourish, changes have occurred. Attention is being given to better coordination, duplication of research has eventually been eliminated, diversity of customer base has increased, and credible accountability and marketing of the Cooperative Extension System is occurring. The research agenda is established and driven by the private sector.

Federal dollars for CES have evaporated in the last decade. Outreach functions of universities in some states integrate Cooperative Extension into their university outreach, while in other states Cooperative Extension is the major outreach arm of the university. Universities are supporting programs deemed significant for their own survival. New federal dollars are available to all public higher education systems.

The client receives information via expensive technological equipment owned primarily by wealthy individuals and corporations. Cooperative Extension employees with specialized skills are employed by communities or large corporations in a contractual basis.

Summary of Results

Feedback from 21 surveys is summarized below.

Questions #1   How will this scenario change the land-grant system in your state?

> The Land-grant System may be changed by this scenario by being more focused and specialized priorities set outside of the system. There are more divisive attitudes and less connectivity among employees.

Questions #2   How will this scenario impact your program area and current position?

> The scenario may impact programs and positions. There will be fewer Extension positions. Staff will need to be generalists. Many of the current positions as we know them may no longer exit. There will be more contract workers.

Question #3   What publics do you see being served and under-served under this scenario? Why and

<u>in what ways?</u>

> With this scenario, under-represented groups will continue to be under-served. Those who are identified as the "haves" will continue to be served. There will also be a division between those who have access to technology and those who don't. Many thought that limited resource families would be served through federal, state and county grants.

<u>Question #4</u>   <u>What implications are there for personnel under this scenario?</u>

> The scenario would have major implications for staffing. Focus would be on more specialization and potential for short term contractual services, thus fewer permanent employees with shorter tenure. Accountability and documentation and impact and performance will be the expected.

<u>Question #5</u>   <u>What are examples you are aware of the exemplify current organizational and/or personnel responses to the scenario?</u>

> There was a mixed response to the question, with some indicating no response. In wealthy counties and states there is a heavy reliance on outside funding sources, i.e., New York and Wisconsin. In some states, short-term appointments and contracts for services address staffing patterns alluded to in this scenario.

<u>Question #6</u>   <u>What additional thoughts or comments do you have to offer that would add to the completeness or clarity of the scenario?</u>

> Strong institutions will get stronger.

<u>Question #7</u>   <u>How did you feel about participating in this pilot effort?</u>

> Generally, positive reaction, follow-up desired, and it forced the process of looking at the future.

Scenario #2

In 2010 the public and private university system is addressing the educational needs of a world wide audience. The Cooperative Extension System (CES) is serving as the premier model for establishing linkages at the community and local level which facilitates delivery of programmatic outreach nationally and internationally. Universities are engaged in sharing research, educational and evaluation expertise. Led by Cooperative Extension, the total University is involved in outreach providing communities with support necessary to achieve maximum quality of life. All public universities are accountable to the public for educating the citizenry of the world and resolving critical issues through appropriate educational intervention. CES uses world expertise to resolve critical issues. State of the art educational technology exists at all levels for educational program delivery.

Funding to support educational outreach is a combination of public, private, and international sources. CES is partnering with agencies and organizations at global, national and community levels appropriate to address identified needs.

Contract workers are hired to facilitate, identify local needs, write grants, conduct research, and deliver educational programs. Overall accountability and administrative/organizational management of the CES system is streamlined and managed at the state level.

Summary of Results

Feedback from 11 surveys is summarized below.

Question #1   How will this scenario change the land-grant system in your state?

> We have become much more technologically competent. Our linkages to other departments and institutions have increased. Stronger emphasis will be placed on international opportunities and less on local issues of importance. This could improve our resource base. The land-grant system will have become much more effective at addressing urban issues. However, in some states, non-land-grant institutions will be assuming roles of land-grant institutions.

Question #2   How will this scenario impact your program area and current position?

> Many felt that there would not be significant changes other than the need to be kept current on technology and international work, and to put more emphasis on contract workers. The program emphasis on agriculture will likely decline along with consumer science, while youth and community development will increase in importance. Delivery of programs would be

improved. More emphasis on being facilitators and innovators.

Question #3   What publics do you see being served and under-served under this scenario? Why and
               in what ways?

Those being served will likely include those who are Internet literate and especially people with
middle to high income level. Lifestyle Programs (habit forms) will be harder to justify. Those
who do not have computer access or the monetary resources will likely be the losers or under-
served. It is likely that issues of diversity will be a major challenge. People with political clout
will be the winners!

Question #4   What implications are there for personnel under this scenario? Please consider such
               things as training, staffing patterns/positions, competencies, performance evaluations,
               rewards, recruitment and retention.

Staffing for this scenario will be a problem. It's obvious that most people feel that it will be
important to retain a "core" of permanent workers that gladly accept work in expanding areas
and are capable of helping people have ready access to information. There is not the sense of
legal or organizational commitment in the area of "contracted workers/temporary staff." There
will be a move away from subject matter to one of facilitation and accessing information. More
organizational skills and fundraising will be needed. This could put the University out of touch
with people at the local level.

Question #5   What are examples you are aware of that exemplify current organizational and/or
               personnel responses to the scenario?

Some examples include:

C   Family programming with the Department of Health and Human Service in Iowa.
C   Total University outreach with the private sector and governmental agencies in Oregon.
C   Colorado State is working with the total University outreach.

Question #6   What additional thoughts or comments do you have to offer that would add to the
               completeness or clarity of the scenario?

C   Keep local CES current on technology
C   Base programs on needs, not just to show and tell
C   Maintaining local/county connections is critical
C   CES must collect impact/outcome data
C   Keep strong leadership at the top
C   Keep a core of permanent employees to maintain "high touch" educational approach

      C   Fine conceptually but CE must modernize, de-centralize, and allow local program development.

Question #7   How did you feel about participating in this pilot effort?

      C   Enjoyable
      C   Good chance to think about the future
      C   Scary
      C   Fun - not too time consuming
      C   Helped to see CES keep modern.
      C   Was not easy or comfortable
      C   Made me think, thought provoking
      C

Scenario #2 Summary

Those choosing this scenario seem to feel that Cooperative Extension is already on track. We need to keep moving as we are now, especially as it relates to technology. It is likely that personnel will move away from direct contact with clientele. Thus Cooperative Extension will need to firmly establish a core of permanent staff to maintain the "touch" with this "High tech, low touch" scenario.

Scenario #3

The year 2010 finds the Extension system moving into new territory by working with individuals who have not been part of its traditional audience. Research indicates that communities that use broad-based input by a wide range of people are more successful in identifying strengths, securing resources and reaching common goals.

The expertise of the citizenry is instrumental in problem identification and in utilizing their knowledge and experiences as part of the team that generates solutions through research and transfer of new technologies. All community members are involved on an ongoing basis to identify the current issues, needs, and goals of the learning community. The ability to work without defined boundaries is essential to the delivery of educational programs for families, businesses, and individuals.

Far from the days of a county agent traveling out to the farm or home to meet one-on-one with a client, today's Cooperative Extension System uses a full complex of technology coupled with the personal touch, to deliver programs and services to anyone, anywhere, at any time. Local Extension units have moved from having a single focus to being a mix of multi-county or multi-state information and technology centers to support community learning centers.

Extension community learning centers have one or more community educators whose purposes are to educate, facilitate, and provide the connectedness of the community and customers to the land-grant university. Centers have access to the latest technology used not only to identify local needs and provide information but to provide the under- served clientele access to the university. The land-grant university continues to be the "home" of the system and provides the core of Extension educators and researchers to support community based programs.

Contracted workers are well-trained to carry basic information to the people that need educational assistance to better meet the needs of healthy living. Educational intervention helps to move these people from a non-productive segment to one that adds value to decision making at the community level. The special outreach methods employed in this effort have made a lot of people uneasy. Some of the trust that is taken for granted in traditional approaches has taken months or years to develop. Leaders from all segments of the community have a positive impact on identifying community issues and decision making. New collaborations and partnerships are developing with the public assistance groups at both the local and state level.

Government funding continues from federal, state and local sources and institutions of higher education; however, all federal and state dollars are now competitive and open to all universities and others with strict adherence to accountability. The land-grant system has a much stronger competitive edge in searching for private dollars; however, this has raised serious questions about the bias of research and proprietary interests. Not all local governments are on board, primarily due to the lack of resources to support land grant

education efforts. Communities identify issues, develop and support permanent funding plans, and train volunteers to sustain the community centers.

Summary of Results

Feedback from 39 surveys is summarized below.

Question#1 How will this scenario change the land-grant system in your state?

> The system will give more attention to citizen/clientele and community input in shaping educational efforts. This can result in a program that is progressive and relevant to people, thus connecting the university more strongly to communities. It means a move from agriculture-based to community-based needs. The scenario utilizes extensive collaborations and partnerships between 1862, 1890 and 1994 land-grant institutions. It involves more public/private partnerships for Extension. Accountability and evaluation measures will be an integral part of the system. Competitive funding means the system will need to work harder for dollars at all levels. Other public and private universities vie for state and federal dollars and offer services, information and research to people. Issue-specific programs point toward more contract workers and a growing need for new technology and continual training. The movement from county Extension offices to community learning centers requires a mind shift but brings with it a broader range of participants and new audiences.

Question # 2 How will this scenario impact your program area and current position?

> Staff utilize facilitation skills and people skills extensively as they work with communities. Staff need to incorporate lifelong training into their career plans in order to respond to changing program requirements. There seems to be general agreement that staff will do less one-on-one teaching and more work with citizen/community groups. Information and education moves to the realm of multimedia presentations, learning centers and distance/continuing education. All program areas need staff with greater expertise to identify messages and mediums to meet clientele's needs in a competitive market. There is an expansion and strengthening of family, youth and community development program areas. Many see this scenario making their job more dynamic and allows for creativity.

Question #3 What publics do you see being served and under-served under this scenario? Why and in what ways?

> Comments run from "all" to only those covered by the current identified issue. In general, respondents seem to think low resource audiences will be served from grant or targeted funds. Middle class audiences access Extension through distance learning vehicles. Upper class clients buy information and services from whomever has what they want, which may or may not be the Extension system. Communities with strong voices and leadership can dictate and direct program resources. Agencies, government, corporations and institutions of higher learning are all publics to be served in an atmosphere of collaboration. Staff will become more politically astute and, in turn, can assist publics in developing a political voice. There is a possibility the

traditional Extension audience will be under-served because they are less likely to be a program focus. Poor communities with a weak voice and little leadership may get lost. Institutions that are not competitive or unwilling to collaborate will suffer.

Question #4 What implications are there for personnel under this scenario? Please consider such things as training, staffing patterns/position, competencies, performance evaluation, rewards, recruitment and retention.

Training is a critical component with the use of contracted workers. There will be less demand for straight discipline training. Staffing patterns are in continual flux. Few employees work solely for the Extension system. Learning centers might be staffed by a coordinator, technology people, and people skilled in resource identification and group facilitation. Teaching staff could be funded from a number of sources and contracted for specific programs. Administrative staff should shrink. The permanent staff competencies include skills in : facilitation, conflict resolution, leadership, resource management, communication and technology competence. Short-term employees on contract for subject matter need to be highly trained in their fields of expertise. Organizational demands like performance evaluations will be difficult because individuals will be working across lines with lots of different clientele and teams. The system operates more like a business with less job security and no promotion and tenure process. Salaries become more competitive and personnel having increasing opportunities for advancement due to an emphasis on entrepreneurial effort. Retention and recruitment will be difficult. The system can expect short-term staff rather than career people. This has significant meaning for training of staff, program delivery and traditional client expectations.

Question #5 What are examples you are aware of that exemplify current organizational and /or personnel responses to the scenario?

C   Short-term contracted workers
C   Technology oriented clients
C   Program leadership integrated across programs
C   Outsourcing hiring procedures
C   Outsource staffing
C   Distance education delivery
C   Engaged university concept and discussion
C   Multi-county, multi-state, regional and interdisciplinary activities (ex.: CYFAR)
C   Public policy education efforts on the increase
C   Competitive grants
C   Partnerships
C   Use of contracts, collaboration, resource sharing

Question #6 What additional thoughts or comments do you have to offer that would add to the completeness or clarity of the scenario?

Participants are all across the board from thinking most states are headed in this direction to the scenario representing a significant shift or choice for states. Questions arise about how the Extension system would interface with the land-grant institutions. A pertinent reminder - piecemeal programs don't have long-term impact or public support. Special programs as a part of ongoing, reliable, proactive base programs can address short-term needs and provide the support system to maintain success long-term. The scenario demands new resources or reallocation of resources. There is a need for multi-year U.S. government funding. The scenario needs to clarify the significant changes that could occur in university staffing and tenure.

Question #7 How did you feel about participating in this pilot effort?

Respondents were pleased to participate and honored to be included. Several mentioned it allowed critical thinking and reflection about the future of the Extension system. They saw it as visionary and felt as though they were part of a future process. Some had questions about how the information will be used and would like to see a compilation of the answers received. Dissenting comments noted the scenarios were driven from the top without enough local input and do not reflect strong linkages to all aspects of the land-grant system.

Scenario #3 Summary

Respondents were in general agreement that scenario #3 was a real possibility. Although they didn't necessarily agree with all presented, they were more comfortable with #3 than the other two possibilities. They recognize that Extension staff will need to change their "box of thinking" which will be exciting, challenging or impossible depending upon the individual staff person.

C:\WINDOWS\TEMP\PODC.wpd jc